

## **REMARKS**

### **Summary**

Claims 6 and 16 have been cancelled, without prejudice.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 10-11, 13-15, 17, and 20-24 have been amended. All amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-24 are now pending.

### **Rejections against claims 1, 3-6, 11, 13-16 and 21-24 under 35 USC 102(b)**

Claim 6 has been cancelled, rendering its rejection moot.

As noted earlier, claims 1, 3-5, 11, 13-15 and 21-24 have been amended.

Independent claims 1, 11 and 21 are patentable over Horvitz because it fails to anticipate at least the limitations of rendering second execution results on the back surface of a metaphoric desktop, and morphing the current visible surface of the metaphoric desktop from the front surface to the back surface, to make the second execution results visible. As noted in past responses, Horvitz merely teaches rendering of windows on planes of a 3-D virtual space using the front surface of a metaphoric desktop.

Claims 3-5, 13-15 and 22-24 depend on claims 1, 11 and 21 respectively, incorporating their limitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 3-5, 13-15 and 22-24 are patentable over Horvitz.

### **Rejection of claims 2 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 2 and 12 depend on claims 1 and 11, incorporating their limitations, respectively. Since claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Horvitz, therefore, by

definition, claims 2 and 12 are patentable over Horvitz. Boneth does not remedy the above discussed deficiencies of Horvitz. Thus, claims 2 and 12 are patentable over Horvitz even when combined with Boneh.

#### Rejection of claims 7 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 7 and 17 have been amended to conform to the amendments being entered for claims 1 and 11.

Claims 7 and 17 depend on claims 1 and 11, incorporating their limitations, respectively. Since claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Horvitz, therefore, by definition, claims 7 and 17 are patentable over Horvitz. Taylor does not remedy the above discussed deficiencies of Horvitz. Thus, claims 7 and 17 are patentable over *Horvitz* even when combined with Tylor.

#### Rejection of claims 8-10 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 10 and 20 have been amended to conform to the amendments being entered for claims 1 and 11.

Claims 8-10 and 18-20 depend on claims 1 and 11 respectively, incorporating their limitations. Since claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Horvitz, therefore, by definition, claims 8-10 and 18-20 are patentable over Horvitz. As discussed earlier, neither Taylor nor Boneh remedy the above discussed deficiencies of Horvitz, therefore for at least the same reasons, claims 8-10 and 18-20 are patentable over Horvitz even when combined with Taylor and Boneh.


#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-24 are in condition for allowance, and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account  
No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,  
Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, PC

Date: January 3, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Al AuYeung, Reg. No. 35,432  
Attorney for Applicant

Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
503-796-2437